REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING

Helsinki Administrative Court (helsinki.hao@oikeus.fi)

Case Number: **3471/2026, T3/AIS**

MIGRI Decision: 94/830/2026

Appellant: E.F. Fluff

Email ****

Phone: +**********

Date: 31st July 2026

MOTION REQUEST FOR AN ORAL HEARING

I respectfully request that the Court arrange an oral hearing in this matter. I have been advised by Finnish nationals observing the proceedings to request this. This request is made because the issues in dispute cannot be fairly or adequately determined on the written record alone, and because an oral hearing is necessary for the proper assessment of credibility, context, coercion, disability-related barriers, and the structure of the evidence placed before the authorities.

The matter concerns issues of exceptional seriousness for me, including trafficking-related abuse, coercive control, false reporting, and the denial of effective protection. Its significance is not merely procedural or financial. It concerns my safety, my dignity, and my effective access to justice. It is my life. I am trying to reclaim three years of my life, in a situation where Finnish Authorities have very clear dehumanised me to a point where I am essentially being told that the Finnish Constitution and the EU charter of Fundamental Rights do not apply to me.

Parallel to this, I have representatives of Finnish State Authority, Ulosottolaitos, Riika Haverinen informing me I'm not human I am rubbish. Telling me clearly that she is aware an entire sixteen month eviction proceedings were wholly fraudulent, fabricated as abuse. That my trafficker and her lawyer repeatedly committed perjury about rent and purpose of the proceedings, but that she will not do anything because I am rubbish.

The actions of Pasila Police amplified through MIGRI who have deleted record of my earlier pleading attempts for help to falsely inform the Court that March 2026 was my first point of contact. Whilst simultaneously advancing the narrative of my trafficker and abuser, when I have witnesses and evidence contrary. At the same time as actual objective reality and my traffickers own contradictory statements and Court filings rejects the false narrative spun to MIGRI, the Courts, the Police.

Grounds:

An oral hearing is necessary because the written material does not allow the Court to properly assess the full factual context, the manner in which coercion was exercised against me, or the way in which key narratives were built up and repeated through reports made to the authorities. The

existing record itself shows disputes concerning facts, credibility, omitted context, and the meaning of communications and events. These are matters that can be examined more appropriately and more fairly in an oral hearing.

I am also affected by disability, including the fact that I do not have my medication, and by trauma-related limitations which make written-only proceedings an inadequate means for me to participate effectively in this case. An oral hearing would allow the Court to assess me directly, with appropriate accommodations, and would reduce the risk that written material produced in a fragmented and scattered manner under disability and trauma is misunderstood, taken out of context, or stripped of its proper meaning.

Need for Oral Evidence:

Without an oral hearing, I will not be able to fully explain the extent of Vuorivirta's abuse, the attempts at evidence construction, the efforts to force, bully, and cajole me into falsely admitting criminal activity, and the threats of prison made when I asked for my belongings to be returned. The threats of police violence if I continued asking for my belongings back. The mixed media contradictory messaging, and more.

Without an oral hearing, the scale of the trafficking-related abuse, the coercive methods used against me, and the manner in which Vuorivirta's false reports were constructed and presented to the authorities and to the Court will not be apparent from the written materials alone.

This is particularly so because there are too many interrelated incidents to be adequately conveyed through fragmented written submissions alone. These include, by way of example, Vuorivirta's conduct during February, March, and April 2024 in attempting to bully me into falsely admitting "criminal liability"; her forcing her lawyer-patient back into my life in March 2024; the car accident she refused to call the police for and resulting spine injury she refused to take me to hospital for; the phone recording in which Vuorivirta told me that she was keeping me under surveillance through my neighbour; the triangulation abuse using friends and associates; and the sabotage of outside loans that would have gotten me free of her financial control. Or the fact that the evidentiary record from June 2023 and early onward shows me repeatedly having to tell Vuorivirta to stop attempting construction and fabrication of evidence in response to requests for breaking up or cessation of abuse. Correspondence at the time, that was often wholly incoherent, but only useful for a later narrative—which again, at the time, there is evidentiary record of me querying and asking why I could not just be allowed to leave peacefully and quietly.

The fact that Vuorivirta has responded to valid professional complaints and criminal complaints with a wall of DARVO *(Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender)* "Fluff is lying. Fluff makes these complaints to harass me. The complaints are invalid" a situation which she has managed to maintain to a degree that interconnected authorities do not review the complaints. Such as the Valvira complaint: a psychotherapist repeatedly breaching another persons medical privacy, inserting false information to medical records, forcing her patients into a persons life, involving me in the treatment of her patients, with a heavy record of recordings of them repeating "I will lose my licence to practice if anyone finds out about this". Or Vuorivirta involving me in tax fraud or

Vuorivirta screaming at me about the €290,000 bribe I was offered for Erkki and Erja Pasanen or Vuorivirta threatening to destroy my title deeds for my property as a behavioural control mechanism.

The fact that there are multiple witnesses around the world willing to testify a wholly different version of events.

More simply put: in three years my narrative and version of events has never changed, and that version remains:

- My legal papers, Court submissions, Court evidence, handwritten medical records returned.
- Resolution of the disability employment with Alegria Psychology Oy
- Resolution of the disability employment secondary lease with Alegria Psychology Oy, including as both KELA and I asked, the ability to pay to prevent more debt creation and debt bondage.
- Resolution of the disability employment secondary lease with Alegria Psychology Oy, including as both KELA and I asked, specifically so I could move on with my then new partner ******
- Financial records for the now-known to be fake Norwegian Bank Loan so that I could repay it and avoid any further or continued debt bondage to Vuorivirta.
- Agreement for peaceful resolution for all financial matters between myself and Vuorivirta.
- Peaceful retraction of all false statements and defamation. I repeatedly stated I would take no legal action if Vuorivirta retracted her false statements, which included false statements to Pasila Police about our relationship and my mental health. False statements that had to be countered by showing graphic sexual messaging from Vuorivirta and my own treat-psychiatrist writing to Pasila Police.

Vuorivirta and Riivari's statements have changed as the situation required, first I'm only a tenant. That gets disproven with sexual message and abusive messaging. Then it's a relationship dispute, "expensive couples therapy" then it's Vuorivirta who tried to go no contact, when there are literal messages from me saying "you're dead to me, do not contact me.". Then my Irish Police brutality case is fake and I'm trying to con money out of people. Then it's there was no loan, just financial assistance, but that get's disproved when it is pointed out to a police officer that Vuorivirta is in receipt of 90% of my illness-welfare each month—and it is observed that makes no sense against accusations of scamming. Then it's false statements of romantic obsession, except I was happily settled with a partner trying to escape her abuse. Except Vuorivirta and Riivari have shifted the dates of what they are accusing me of. Employment that does not exist to two different Courts and Pasila Police, but suddenly exists to MIGRI and I simply did not understand the terms?

All of this was kept together by vague, wholly unprofessional, and professionally sanctionable statements about my mental health, including repeated allusions that I was "deeply mentally ill." At the same time, Pasila Police repeatedly attempted to have me sectioned and disappeared into the

mental health system in order to conceal their own grave misconduct and negligence in the matter. Yet the actual psychiatric assessments did not support that narrative. Hartman Hospital and Turku Psychiatric Prison assessed me as not delusional, not psychotic, sane, and not sectionable, but as a person who was very angry and upset at what was being done to me.

The above condensed helicopter fragment overview of the situation is cliché. It is cliché coercive control trafficking abuse—or would be—**IF** the genders were reversed. As it stands, I remain trapped in a position of DARVO *(Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender).* One that is wholly incoherent: no landlord refuses payment or avenue for payment when a tenant is begging to be released. Whilst simultaneously claiming the tenant refuses to pay, refuses to leave. No victim refuses to return another persons personal belongings then claims the persons increasingly distressed begging for their belongings is "stalking" "romantic obsession" whilst simultaneously refusing to return any personal possessions. That is incoherent. It is psychological manipulation and control abuse. It is classical human trafficking behaviour.

Why am I the one begging for my belongings back, for retraction of false statements so I can expressly move on with my life and be free of Vuorivirta? And have been for three-years. The situation is incoherent against objective reality.

These matters require oral explanation in order for the Court to understand their sequence, connection, and significance.

An oral hearing is also necessary under Section 37 of the Administrative Judicial Procedure Act (586/1996), which provides that an oral hearing shall be arranged when necessary for the clarification of the matter. An administrative court must arrange an oral hearing if it would bring further clarification to the case. In this matter, an oral hearing is essential for the proper assessment of credibility, context, coercion, and disability-related barriers, which cannot be fairly determined on the written record alone.

Fair Trial

I submit that the Court can only properly evaluate these issues by hearing me orally and hearing the relevant witnesses such as ****, *****, ******, and others. Each of whom has been a direct witness to an objective reality that completely contradicts the construction created by Vuorivirta.

Where the case turns in substantial part on how events unfolded, how statements were procured, how records were shaped, and how coercion operated in practice, a written-only process creates a serious risk of unfairness, and being wholly incomplete.

For those reasons, I request that the Court grant an oral hearing and make any necessary procedural accommodations to ensure effective participation, including remote attendance, interpretation, advance notice of issues to be addressed, and reasonable adjustments connected to disability and trauma.

Respectfully submitted,
E.F. Fluff